

John Tombes

7 My

HIS

SUPPLEMENT

Or Second Book

About Swearing,

Disproved, and made Void; and his abusing
the Scripture plainly manifested.
Against which the Truth of Christ's words
is vindicated and maintained.

In a few words briefly returned to him.

From { Richard Hubbert Horne,
And
Samuel Fisher. }

L O N D O N,

Printed for Robert Wilson, at the Signe of the
Black Spread-Eagle and Wind-mill in
Martins la Grand, 1661.

John Tompbes

1712

SUPPLEMENT

Of Second Book

About Swearing.

Disproved, and made Void; and his speaking
the Scripture plainly manifested.

Against which the Truth of Christ's words
is vindicated and maintained.

In a few words briefly returned to him

Richard Humberstone,

And

From

St. Paul's Church.

LONDON,

Printed for Robert Wilson, at the Signe of the
Black Spread-Eagle and Wind-mill in
Martins-le-Grand, 1661.

Supplementum Sublatum,
John Tombes his Supplement, or second Book,
about Swearing disproved.

John Tombes; thy first part of speech in proof of the Lawfulness of Swearing, being (it seems) such an Adjective as could not well stand by it self against such as have answered it, without the supply of some other words to be joyned with it, thou hast added another part of speech, (for even this also is but a part of what thou sayst thou yet intendest to make upon that subject) as a little Supplement (so thou callst it) to supply the defects of the former, which thou confessest did want framing, method, and matter. But when thou against reviewest this thy last Supplement, it will need little more condemnation than the words of thy own mouth. Therefore we shall say a little to thee, lest thou be wise in thy own conceit, if thou be unanswered altogether; and yet but a little, lest we should seem to be like thy self, in multiplying words without method and matter. The substance of thy book being answered already in a book called *Our Annidote more against Swearing*, we shall speak to some passages in it relating to our selves.

As first, Thou sayst page 40. that the using of these speeches, *God knows*, or *I asseure before God*, or *God is our witness*, or *This we say in the presence of him that shall judge both quick and dead*; as an appeal to God's consideration, is plain swearing; and that *Sam. Fifteen* swears in his book entitled *The Raskincks Alarm to the Rabbies*; p. 48. 61. in saying, *God knows, I asseure before God and all men*; and so while we speak against all swearing, we practise some swearing.

Reply, It is made plain in that book entitled *Our Annidote more against swearing*, that these are no oaths; and here again, that if they were oaths, being very frequent with *David* (as *Hen. Den* saith) to use them stiller than *Agasthe* (whom ye justify therein) uncalled to it, by or before a Magistrate, (which is the only swearing now disputed for) did swear as frequently, commonly, and continually with the *Saints* & *C. barabas*, (among whom his credit was so good; that his word might at any times be taken without an oath)

(2)
oath) and consequently as *unnecessarily* as other men, which do use frequent, ordinary, and *unnecessary* swearing, which both *J. Tombs*, *Hen. Den*, and *Jer. Ives* do unanimously disallow; and so ye are guilty of egregious partiality, condemning in some the things which ye allow in others.

Moreover, if those be *Oaths*, how is it that the *Judges* and *Justices* in Sessions will not own them as so, and set free those prisoners when they offer to say *God knows*, *God is witness*, &c. that we intend no other but good, peaceableness, faithfulness and truth to the *King*, and *all men*, &c. Surely the *Magistrates* in *England* do not believe the *Priests* doctrine, for if they did, they would practise it; so that we may conclude, That they do but bear the *Ayr*, and spend their strength for nought, when both *Magistrates* and people will neither believe nor practise that for truth, which their *Priests* deliver for doctrine.

And whereas *J. Tombs* saith in p. 5. *That those Baptists of Maidstone have offered an Engagement taken before some Justices of the Peace in a solemn manner, with calling God to witness to the truth of what they say, and that they do offer to swear, and take an oath.*

Reply. Herein he hath condemned the *Judges* at *Maidstone*, either to be ignorant of an *Oath*, or else to proceed in unjust judgement against them; seeing the *Judges* required nothing of them but an *Oath*, and they offered an *Oath*, and yet they would not receive it; so that instead of condemning the prisoners because they cannot swear, he hath condemned the *Judges*, for not knowing, or at least not owning an *Oath* when it was offered them; and so contrary unto right Rule and Justice, keeping them still in prison for not swearing, who offered willingly to swear (as he saith) so that it appears that the *Judges* do not more agree with *J. Tombs*'s judgement than that was an *Oath*, then the *Quakers* do. But what strange Doctrine (or rather confusion) is this in *J. Tombs*, to accuse the *Quakers* because they will not swear and yet say that they do swear fully and plainly? And yet the *Judges*, *Mayors*, and *Magistrates* will not take it: So that by *J. Tombs*'s book, and the rest that have been written for swearing, the *Quakers* are found guilty, and the *Magistrates* only are to be blamed and reprov'd, because they will not accept of an *Oath*, when it is offered to be given by those of whom they require it.

But again secondly, If to say, *God knows*, or *God is witness*, as an appeal to *Gods* contemplation, be swearing by *God*, then to say such a

man himself, or such a man is witness to the truth of what I say, as an appeal to that man's confession is a swearing by that man; which (*Adhuc absurdum hoc iuxta carboem notandum*) if these Baptists J. T. H. B. J. C. &c. or any others shall say it is, We shall say they are not yet so wise as they will be, when they once come with the Quakers to own the truth, which they now deny.

Again, J. Tombs saith, That Christ is nowhere called the Oath of God.

Reply. In the same sense, and place, in which he is called the Covenant of God, as *Isa. 55. 5.* he is called the Oath of God; for God's Covenant is his Oath, which he swore *Luke 1. 72, 73.*

Again, J. T. saith, That there is no instance given by Sam. Fisher of any place where *oath* is used in a more moderate sense than to bind by Oath.

Reply. What needed one to be given by S. F. when thou gavest one thy self? viz. *1 Thess. 5. 27.* which is translated (truly enough) *I charge you by the Lord*; which is no more but I will, require, or command you, in God's sight, presence, or such like; which thou falsely saist is a charging or requiring one to swear by the Lord.

Or secondly, What need any more instance be given than thou hast given thy self, who confellest it over again in thy Supplement, p. 8, 9. more plainly than in thy former? confessing to thy further confutation, that these three places, viz. *1 Thess. 5. 27. 1 Tim. 6. 13. 2 Tim. 4. 1.* are alike charges, and that the word *μαρτυρεω* used *1 Tim. 6. 13.* is only to command, or enjoin, and doth not include an oath or swearing; and that the word *διαμαρτυρομαι* used *2 Tim. 4. 1.* signifies no more than *I witness before God*; so that as it was told thee before, it is most evident, that Paul at that distance wherein he was from them when he wrote to the *Thessalonians* and *Timothy*, either did not charge them to take an Oath, or if he did, they did not take it, nor swear to him; unless we shall suppose they swore to some other that stood present as Paul's proxy, by word of mouth to exact it of them; which absurdity is more fit to be exploded than supposed.

Again, Thou sayst p. 10. That S. F. shews no instance where *in* with an accusative case is a particle of affirming without swearing, and till he doth, is necessarily is a particle of swearing.

Reply. No, not necessarily; for whether with or without an accusative case, it soundeth out no more than some strong affirmation

of

of a thing, as with *verity*, *truth*, *intensity*, or such like; and differs little more from *yes* in Greek (with is *ya* in English) than the English *yes*, and *yes verily* do differ from each other; whence the Latine adverb *ita*, with a diphthong, derived (as it is to be seen in the Latine Dictionaries) of *ita* or *ita* in the Greek, with *ita* or long *e*, which is englished no otherwise then by *truly*, *worthily*, *is verily*, *deed*, or such like; and the very Accidence it self makes it a particle of affirming only, and not of swearing. And however *J. Tomber* saith, that *Grammarians* make the Greek *ita* a particle of swearing, yet the *Lexicographers* make it as well a particle of affirming only, without swearing, as in that place *1 Cor. 13*: it being evident enough, that *Paul* in that place did not swear, when he saith, *I protest by your rejoicing*, &c. for to swear by any thing but God, is by all judged to be unlawful.

But *J. Tomber* replies thus; That *Paul* swears by God even in those expressions an Oath (saith he) of Oppignoration, Pawning, or Execration, wishing therein the forfeiture of his own rejoicing in Christ Jesus, if it were not so as he said; as when we say *On my salvation it is so*, &c.

Reply. If this had been an Oath of Oppignoration (as thou vainly call it) or pawning of his own part or share in Christ's joy, then he would have mentioned his own rejoicing in Christ Jesus only, and not that of the *Corinthians* also; for what reason soever he had to wish the forfeiture, or to pawn his own, yet he had neither right nor reason to wish the forfeiture of theirs; or to pawn the *Corinthians* part in the joy of Christ Jesus upon it, that it was so as he spake unto them; no more then any of us have to wish evil to another man, or to pawn other mens salvation, or to wish another man damned, in case it be not true that we speak; which is a thing altogether unwisely, unlawful, and unreasonable unto those that have the spirit of judgement and understanding. And so *J. Tomber* his pleading for swearing from such places, is only to be judged a fruit of ignorance of Christ's Doctrine, or rather enmity against it.

But *J. Tomber* saith, that swearing is a moral commandment, and therefore lawful.

Reply. If swearing be a commandment, and a duty to be continued, as the rest of the commandments are. Then it is to be performed as a duty and command continually, without any respect to the Magistrate's imposing or requiring of it; for we are to love God with our whole heart, &c. without being required by the Magistrate.

Mightiness, which is the first Commandment; and we are to love our neighbour as our selves, being the second, in which all the other is included; some of which respect are a command from man for the obedience of others.

But again, if James talk from the command, and faith, his greatest argument and inducement to swear, is, because he davying of it hath caused, And is like to cause great persecution to those that hold the truth above Baptisme, and that they will be counted persons inexterminable; and also he faith, that by his preaching swearing lawfull, he hath saved hundreds of thousands from being brought down and their families by it to enjoy their liberty from ruling.

Reply. So that it appears it is to save people from persecution, and spoiling of their goods, and to keep their outward liberty, that James hath preached up swearing, and so it seems they have the reward of their obedience to his Doctrine already; and upon this account, he nor those that follow him, need never suffer persecution, if they will but obey the commands of Christ, as any outward power comes upon them to threaten them with suffering; so that in the day of his tryal, we have no ground otherwise to believe, but that he will deny and break any of Christ's commands, (and teach men so) rather then suffer persecution, seeing he hath thus begun with this command of Christ, Swear not at all, which he would make of none effect by his tradition.

Now seeing the Scripture saith, He that breaketh the least commandment, and teach men so, he shall be least (or not at all) in the Kingdom of God; therefore all such are to be denied, who make a trade of preaching, and when their Doctrines come to be tryed, they are found to be but the Ministers of sin, and to live by the sins of the people; so that all people may consider and take notice, whether this be a sufficient ground or plea, either for preaching up, or believing swearing to be lawfull, because thereby they may be freed from persecution; which is the greatest hypocrisie that can be. ~~And~~ ~~pleased~~ or practised by those that profess to be religious. But the day is come which to some hath made, and to others is making all things manifest, and is declaring every man's work of what sort it is, that the deceivers folly may be made manifest unto all men, that from them the people may be brought into the doctrine and way of salvation, which is now freely held forth and published by the power, and in the demonstration of the Spirit of God as they have freely received it; not for filthy

